

Hoosier Archives was originally a periodic listing of the Diplomacy archives of Walter Buchanan, R. R. #3, Lebanon, Indiana 46052, telephone (317) 482-2824; Archives Director, Postal Diplomacy Congress, and V-P/Treas., International Diplomacy Association. It is now primarily a Diplomacy gazette devoted to articles on good play, demonstration games such as the Multiple Winners Invitational (1972CR) now in progress, rating systems, and game news. Information from the archives is vital for all this and is available to the public as well. Although the archives is virtually complete in at least xerox form, missing undamaged originals are solicited, either for purchase or a loan to permit xeroxing. (See the last archives listing in Hoosier Archives #53 for zines needed.) Many original spares are now available from the archives; more are solicited so as to make them available to others. A subscription to Hoosier Archives is 13/\$2.00 or 6/\$1.00; back issues are 15¢ apiece (20% discount for all available). Ask for #87 to get a list of all articles through #90. This is Albatross Press publication #103.

MULTIPLE WINNERS INVITATIONAL (1972CR)
(Average Aces Trophy Game)
Winter 1902

NAUS VOWS TO FIGHT RUSSIAN BEAR TO THE DEATH!

On Naus the tables reverse
As Turkey and Russia converse,
The English have stumbled;
The standings are jumbled,
Whose body will be first in
the hearse?

London (23 December 1902):

In Craven-street, strand, ten attorneys find place,
And ten dark coal barges are moored at its base,
Fly, hearty, fly; seek some safer retreat
For there's craft in the river and craft in the street.

AUSTRIA: Removes F Aeg. (Has: A Boh, A Bud, A Tri, A Ser)
(Naus)

ENGLAND: (Su02: F Nwy R Nwg) Removes A Ed1, F Lon. (Has: F Nwg, F Nth, A Bur)
(McCallum)

FRANCE: Builds A Bre. (Also has: F Eng, A Bel, A Par, F Gas, A Mar)
(Birsan)

GERMANY: A Bur refuses to retreat /d/. Builds A Kie. (Also has: F Hel, F Den, A Hol,
(Prosnitz) A Ruh)

ITALY: Builds A Nap. (Also has: A Tyr, A Ven, F Ion, F Gre)
(Beyerlein)

RUSSIA: Builds F StP(nc), A War. (Also has: A Nwy, F Sue, A Gal, A Rum, F Sev)
(Ver Ploeg)

TURKEY: Builds A Anr. (Also has: A Bul, F Bla, F Con)
(Iakofka)

Spring 1903 Orders are due not later than noon (9:00 A.M. for phone calls) on Saturday, 4 November 1972.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: Raters take note. Bob Van Andel (749 Thomas St. SE, Grand Rapids, Mich. 49503) would like to announce that an issue of Terminus will be out soon. John McCallum and I will be helping Bob in this very important task of publishing a supply center record of all completed postal games by checking his data.

I regret to say that Mike Rocamora's name was inadvertently omitted from the list of 30 points and over in the last Archives Publisher's Poll. Mike's score is especially significant since he has been playing for such a short time. I've also personally noticed him to be on top of many of his games and he has even joined the exalted ranks of players that have gained 3 units as Austria in the first year.

Rick Brooks' article in Hoosier Archives #92, "The Evils of the Rating System," prompted a couple of interesting responses. One is from an old hand, Len Lakofka, and the other is from a novice of 2 months, Chic Hilliker. Obviously, rating systems do have their proponents.

ANOTHER REBUTTAL
by Len Lakofka

Rick Brooks has issued a blanket condemnation of rating systems because of his philosophy of player intangibility. He has leveled some rather unsubstantiated remarks about Rod Walker. He has made it seem that as long as rating systems exist greedy, hungry, green-eyed players will try to win Diplomacy games. How horrid!

Why do we all play Diplomacy? Because it is tense, exciting competition that is fun? Yes, I'd say that is the large measure of it. If a rating happens to go up or down in addition, there is no loss and no gain to the next exciting tense competition. We play because we really like the game. Rick implies that we are rating-hungry monsters. But ratings or not, would we not try to win, or failing that, stop another from winning, or failing that, do as well as we could in line with our private sense of commitment to other players? I think we would. Would it be fun to play to lose? Would it be fun to screw around in the name of some disorganized circus plot?

Rick totally distorts the use and value of rating systems. They are the playing archives of our hobby's past. Were each game separate from all other games that ever have been or ever will be, then ratings would be meaningless. But most games do interrelate--they have common players. Ratings are guides to a player's ability which give a numerical representation of his playing history. You can consult other unbiased players (like Rick?) or look up past games to aid you in determining a player's ability. The rating system, or better yet, the results of a few systems, gives a capsule account of a player's skill. Ratings never tried to measure how much fun you had or how hard you worked in one game as opposed to another--they can't. That is a personal, subjective decision.

Let me ask Rick if he plays to win. If he does, then he does play to impress others by winning. If he doesn't play to win, then maybe he should play solitaire or Old Maid. He'd have fun!

For the record, let me report that Rod Walker does not have sole control over regularity/irregularity of games. Each of the other systems could use his opinion or reject it. McCallum and Labelle do not use Rod's account. Walt Buchanan does not and I don't believe Jeff Power does either.

I think that ratings can improve the game. I believe better systems can be devised that measure player skill more accurately. Each game will still be played by its seven players and whether one has a high or low rating, the desire to do well will still exist.

A NEWCOMER'S VIEWS ON RATING SYSTEMS
by Chic Hilliker

Rick brings out some good points for abolishing rating systems. But let's face it, deep down inside, most people are playing the game to win, not just for the game itself. I enjoy playing the game for the challenge that it provides me. The challenge is the question of whether I can out-wheel and deal and out-maneuver six other people. After the game progresses, some people might become content with coming in below first, but only when faced with the situation where they either can't win, i.e., hopelessly behind, or to win they must stab somebody in the back. Most notably, someone whom they have had a strong alliance with for the whole game. This whole area of what people will settle for will be more illuminated when Edi Birsan publishes the final results of his poll.

Obviously, there has to be some way to take the personal nature out of the ratings. Just because someone does not like someone else's method of doing things is no reason not to rate their games. I think that except in cases of gross violations of good conduct (one person playing two countries unknown to the other players) all games should be rated. Now I know that someone will say, what constitutes a gross violation of good conduct. I don't know, nor do I want to be the person or one of the persons responsible for working the problem out. Unfortunately, there is no one Diplomacy organization, so that the problem can not

be solved by using the organization as a vehicle for a rating system. But then, there is another problem with having a rating system in which the question of what games are to be included is decided by a vote of the members of an organization, particularly now when things appear to be somewhat strained between organizations, Larry Peery's White Paper notwithstanding.

I personally want to see some system of rating the games; I would like to have an idea of who is the best and how I stand compared to him. By best, I mean statistically, not by any poll of a select few people in the Diplomacy community, however good or fair they might be.

Rick argues that playing to impress others is a damn poor motive, which leads one to believe that one should play to impress one's self. Well, that's fine, but you must have some standard to judge yourself by. You certainly can't recall each move you've ever made and judge yourself by that. The only alternative is how well you did in each game. But that is somewhat meaningless without some kind of reference point. This leads us to some kind of system where your performance is judged against another individual's or against the average whole.

Perhaps our culture is too hung up upon winning as a measure of excellence, but if we do not consider winning as a measure of excellence, what do we use? I think that excellence should be rewarded, since without some sort of positive reinforcement most people tend to let their efforts die. Winning provides a form of positive reinforcement.

I think that Rick is right concerning the possible over-influence of rating systems, particularly about how personalities can influence ratings. I think that somehow we have to develop means of providing a completely impartial rating system. As to what kind of rating system should be used, that's another Pandora's box, which I do not feel knowledgeable enough to go into at this time.

As I said earlier, I enjoy playing the game for the challenge it provides me. If I manage to overcome the challenge of six other people, then I am egotistical enough to want some kind of reward for a job well done. I don't think that there are too many people who can say that they don't enjoy reading their name at the top of the list.

ACEINGS! Winter 1902

AMARA (15 December 1902): The Fall of the House of Ver Plug, Chapter 6: "A Ricketybrooksoid," I exclaimed. "How ghastly! I heard of these foul creatures once while in Sidney. They were not even in the zoos, they were so ugly, especially now since they don't wear tags on their heads any longer!"

"But William, you said you had a plan. What is it, my good man?" cooed ~~off~~ Brenton in a trembling voice. "Simple, my dear Brenton. Do you have a pistol?" "Yes, I do, a number of them." "Then follow me to the cellar and we'll put an end to the curse," I said confidently.

Brenton loaded a few pistols and we went down to the dismal cellar. As we walked in a "splat, bpppr" could be heard from the corner of the room. I walked down the stairs and drew a pistol. The creatures moved toward me. Brenton held back on the stairs wondering what I'd do. "Crack, crack, crack," came the report of the weapon and three Ricketybrooksoids' tiny heads exploded. "Crack," another fell.

"By God, William, you're mad!" Brenton leapt down the stairs. "Stop this instant or I'll kill you! I just told you that if they die, we die!"

"But only if they all die, Brenton. If we kill six and keep one prisoner in a deep part of this mansion, we'll be safe. They have a life span of 80 years."

"Crack, crack," and only one, the leader, or "Naus" as they called him, was left. "So, Naus, you villain. Kill ~~off~~, er, Brenton and Suzanne will you? Your evil is ended!"

"Splat, pbpppr!" cried the "Naus," and attacked. "Crack" and the beast crashed before me. "You killed it!" "No, only wounded it, Brenton. Quick, to the cage with it."

Suddenly the door opened atop the stairs. Suzanne stood there, her eyes beet red and her teeth bared to strick! In her hand was a giant scythe. "Kill my pretties, will you?" she shrieked. "They were mine, oh yes, mine!" My lovelies, mine! Not yours!"

"Gad, William, she's gone mad! Apparently each one we killed drove her closer to insanity and death."

Is Suzanne mad? Because ~~because~~ Brenton and William ate all her chocolate brownies while talking over all of this dribble in Chapter 5? Because she really wanted to kill them herself? Because her favorite dry goods store had a fire sale, ...and burned down? Tune in next time when you'll hear "Cretin, you moron!"

VIENNA (13 December 1902): All those phone calls for a set-up--it's nice to have that kind of money to be able to call so many times just to set up somebody.

VIENNA TO ITALY AND TURKEY (14 December 1902): If I must fall, I will do it my way: I will not oppose any of your armies, ONLY the Russian bear. He will get no more of Austrian territory unless you two aid him.

FREMONT (21 December 1902): Announcing the Great Limerick Contest. The first person to submit three decent rhymes for Chula Vista (in case one doesn't work in) will win the originals of my last two columns having all the nasty remarks about Lakofka only lined out. Judges will be the present executive committee of the Tri-State College Wargaming Association, and all decisions will be final.

ANALYSIS (Fall 1902): Rick Brooks, (R.R. 1, Box 167, Fremont, Indiana 46737; comments are invited).

"Doesn't anybody here know how to play this game?"--attributed to Casey Stengel while managing the New York Mets.

Sometimes I wonder. Obviously, it's got to be them instead of me. Doug has been very trusting with Italy's moves in particular showing that he had been informed by Kaus. Otherwise, why risk moving IA Venice when it could be lost? Much as I hate to admit it, Lakofka appears to be the only honest player of the four. And what are England and France up to? Why does France need a build so badly that he gained it at the cost of an English unit already in position?

Austria is in bad shape. Why anybody would be so trusting after a doublecross that left Lakofka moving heaven and earth to get his neighbors in on Austria is a mystery. Now Austria must remove a unit. Turkey is almost sure to build in Smyrna and if he builds a fleet, AF Aegean would be wiped out by fall if Turkey cared to. IF Ionian can convoy in the spring while Turkey moves TF Smyrna S TF Constantinople to Aegean and TF Black Sea to Constantinople. Then in the fall, TF Smyrna to Syria, TF Constantinople to Smyrna and IF Ionian S TF Aegean to Eastern Mediterranean would wipe out the Austrian fleet.

If IF Greece and TA Bulgaria support each other, AF Aegean cannot help any. So Austria had better keep his armies and worry about his home centers. If the opposition pulls together, Austria can at best only keep two centers.

Italy can build IA Naples and convoy into Albania with support from IF Greece or build LA Rome and try to move up his armies into Bohemia, Tyrolia and Venice in the spring. The latter is easy to block while Austria cannot block the convoy without losing Trieste. IA Venice S IA Tyrolia to Trieste makes it impossible for Austria to cut support and he cannot risk moving Trieste or use it to support AA Serbia to Albania.

France can build another fleet in Brest. But either it or FF Gascony will have to wait to move to the Mid-Atlantic (FF Gascony to Spain (nc) makes little difference in position). But another English fleet would be in a much better position to block off the Russian fleets. The Russian build of RA St. Petersburg could be outweighed by an English fleet removal. England can remove EA Edinburgh without too much pain. But the decision between retreating EF Norway (probably Norwegian), EF London and EA Burgundy is hard. It is vital to hold the North Sea. EF London and EF Norwegian can support. Letting the Russians put a fleet in the Norwegian would put another enemy unit on the North Sea. A successful convoy of RA Norway to Clyde would open England's flank fatally. Remove EA Burgundy and position against Germany is momentarily lost. But France can support FA Marseilles to Burgundy.

Germany could retreat to Picardy and have three units on Belgium with England almost certain to be unable to convoy to Holland to cut support. But even if EA Burgundy is removed, leaving Munich open is a risk. Retreating off the board and building GA Munich improves the defensive position.

Russia can build RF St. Petersburg (nc) and RA Warsaw. The fleet can cover his flank

and help the move on England. He has a choice of two armies and RA Warsaw can get into action against Austria sooner.

At this point, Russia seems to be in the best shape. But this game does change fast. Austria can be split three ways, but then what? Italy's best chance to finish in the money would seem to be a three-way alliance with Russia and Germany after the fall of Austria. Russia would probably gain fastest, but Germany would be in position to help out.

THE CALHAMER POINT COUNT RATING LIST BY COUNTRY Turkey (38,150)

3,000	Edi Birsan	1,000	Bob Johnson	.333	Fausto Calabria
2,333	John Smythe		Robert Katzive		Len Lakofka
2,000	Randy Bytwerk		Kurt Krey		Larry Peery
	Andy Phillips		Dave Lebling		Jim Pratt
	Charles Wells		James MacKenzie		Ken Valentine
1,667	Hal Maus		David May		Chris Wagner
1,200	Conrad von Metzke		Don Miller	.250	Cliff Ollila
1,000	John Beshara		Bud Pendergrass	.200	Brian Bailey
	Ron Deilbringer		Jerry Pournelle		Sherry Heap
	Jack Flemming		Rich Rubin		Ted Holcombe
	George Grayson	.500	Chris Schleicher		Rich Purdy
	Jack Greene		Charles Turner		Larry St. Cyr
	George Inzer		Ken Davidson		Jerry White
			Terry Kuch		
			Banks Mebane		

ARCHIVES CIRCULATION SURVEY

The results of the first circulation survey published in Hoosier Archives #55 evoked so much interest that we have decided to run the survey again. The last published results are also much out of date due to zine turnover and other events that have occurred recently in the Diplomacy world. We would therefore like to ask all Diplomacy publishers (or editors that print Diplomacy-related material) to fill out the enclosed form and return it by 30 December 1972. (If you want to use a separate sheet of paper, that is fine.) It might also be interesting if you include type and cost of duplicator, paper, stencils, fluid, etc. An analysis of the results will then be made and published.

Publisher/Editor _____

<u>Zine title</u>	<u>Total Copies/ Issue</u>	<u>=</u>	<u>Total Circulation</u>	<u>+</u>	<u>Spares Saved Initially</u>
1 _____	_____		_____		_____
2 _____	_____		_____		_____
3 _____	_____		_____		_____
<u>Total Circulation</u>	<u>Paid Subs¹</u>	<u>+</u>	<u>Trades</u>	<u>+</u>	<u>Average Complimen- tary Distribution</u>
1 _____	_____		_____		_____
2 _____	_____		_____		_____
3 _____	_____		_____		_____

¹Includes players with sub privileges during their game

* * * * *